



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,407	11/19/2003	Martin A. Lee	1498-164	5324
23117 7:	590 04/21/2006	EXAMINER		INER
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC			WHISENANT, ETHAN C	
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1634	
			DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Assistant Community	10/715,407	LEE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ethan Whisenant, Ph.D.	1634
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 N This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 17-31 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2003 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the	wn from consideration. r election requirement. r. re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ object	•
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	ammer. Note the attached Office	AGUOT OF TOTAL
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No. <u>09/786,521</u> . ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/715,407 Page 2

Art Unit: 1634

Non-Final Action

1. The applicant's Preliminary Amendment filed 19 NOV 03 has been entered. Following the entry of the Preliminary Amendment, **Claim(s) 17-31** is/are pending.

Non-Statutory Obviousness-type Double Patenting Rejection

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/715,407

Art Unit: 1634

3. Claim 17-26, 29-31 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,730,478.

Page 3

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. The scope encompassed by the invention recited in Claims 17-26 and 29-31 falls with the scope encompased by the invention recited in Claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,730,478. The granting of a patent on Claims 17-26 and 29-31 in the instant application would improperly extend "the right to exclude" previously granted on Claims 1-7 in U.S. Patent No. 6,730,478.

4. Claim 27-28 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,730,478 oin view of what was well known in the art.

Claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,730,478 teach all of the limitations of Claims 27-28 except this patent's claims do not teach the limitations recited in Claims 27-28 wherein the pre-determined temperature at which the DNA sequence denatures is determined by the length/GC content of the temperature probe sequence. However, the examiner asserts (Official Notice) that it was well known in the art at the time of the invention that the temperature at which a nucleic acid sequence denatures is dependent upon its length and/or its GC content. Therefore, absent an unexpected result, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method(s) taught in Claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,730,478 wherein the pre-determined temperature at which the DNA sequence denatures is determined by the length/GC content of the temperature probe sequence. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to make this modification in order to know at what temperature the temperature probe sequence of Claims 1-7 will be detectable.

CONCLUSION

Page 4

5. Claim(s) 17-31 is/are rejected and/or objected to for the reason(s) set forth above.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ethan Whisenant, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0754. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30AM - 5:30PM EST or any time via voice mail. If repeated attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jones, can be reached at (571) 272-0745.

The Central Fax number for the USPTO is (571) 273-8300. Before faxing any papers, please inform the examiner to avoid lost papers. Please note that the faxing of papers must conform with the Notice to Comply published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989).

ETHAN WHISENANT PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 1634